

REMARKS

In the specification, paragraphs [0005.5] and [00022] were amended to correct grammatical errors. Paragraph [00019] was deleted because it duplicated paragraph [00028]. Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 7, 12, and 16 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. The preamble of Claim 1 was also amended to make it more succinct. Claims 20 – 36 are added herewith. Claims 1 – 36 are now pending in this application. The remaining claims were amended to conform to the style of newly added claims 20 – 36. Reconsideration of the patentability of the pending claims is requested in view of the remarks and amendments set forth herein.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1, 5, 7, 12 and 16 were objected to because of various informalities. All of the Examiner's suggestions are incorporated into the present amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the claims has been overcome.

35 USC §112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 2 – 7 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph for being indefinite. The Examiner pointed out that antecedent basis for “extension” was lacking. Applicant submits that deletion of “extension” from claim 2 overcomes the §112 rejection.

35 USC §102 (b) Rejection

Claims 1, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 (b) as being anticipated by Cave—U.S. 2,211,879 (hereinafter Cave). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cave is directed to an automobile log that attaches to the visor of a car. The Examiner refers to elements 20 and 21 as resilient members, and element 14 as the back wall of the automobile log. It is unclear whether the Examiner interprets walls 12 and 13 as the side walls, or walls 12a and 13a as the sidewalls. In either case, claim 1 is not anticipated. First, “resilient members” 20 and 21 are not connected at all to walls 12 and 13. Second “resilient members” 20 and 21 are not connected to back wall 14. Neither Figure 3 nor Figure 5 show rivet 31 securing 20 or 21 to back wall 14. Indeed, 21 is clearly shown as being attached at one end to wall 13a and at the other end to a latch on

wall 13a (note Figure 4). However, the latch is not a back wall. Claim 1 recites “first and second resilient members, attached at proximal ends to the respective first and second side wall and at distal ends to the back wall”. As described above, Cave’s resilient members are never attached to back wall 14. Cave thus fails to teach or suggest claim 1 because his resilient members are not attached in the manner as claimed. In addition, walls 13a and 13b in Cave fail to restrain a stack laterally as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon are novel and non-obvious over Cave. Consequently, Applicants request that the 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 18 and 19 be withdrawn.

Cave also fails to teach or suggest newly added claims 20 - 36. Claims 20 and 26 are directed to a clip containing a stack of semiconductor trays. Claim 31 is directed to a method for storing a stack of semiconductor trays. Cave does not pertain to a clip for containing or storing semiconductor trays in the manner as claimed. Therefore, Cave fails to anticipate claims 20, 26, 31 and any of the claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, claims 1 - 36 are allowable over the art of record.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2 - 17 would be allowable if amended to incorporate the features of claim 1. However, Applicants believe that claim 1 is allowable in its current form. Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance indicating that claims 1 – 36 are allowable. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (510) 449-0119 if any matters remain to be discussed concerning the allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Isabelle R. McAndrews', with a stylized, cursive script.

Isabelle R. McAndrews
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,998